

The Examiner's new search revealed a recently issued patent to Segars et al. This reference has been applied, by itself, to claim 21. Claim 21 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 23. Thus, the rejection of claim 21 over Segars et al. alone is overcome.

Claim 23 has been rejected as obvious over the combination of Segars et al. in view of Ueki et al. The Examiner states that the incentive to combine these references is to "improve the integrity of Folwell et al.'s system". However, the Examiner's stated incentive to combine is made only in hindsight. There is no evidence cited by the Examiner to support the stated incentive. "Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight." In re Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Moreover, it appears that these references are not so easily combined. Segars et al. deals with a RISC processor which executes several instructions simultaneously. Ueki et al. appears to deal with a CISC processor which processes one instruction at a time.

It is believed that the amendments made herein to claims 4, 14, 26, and 27 overcome the Examiner's §112 rejection.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David P. Gordon".

David P. Gordon
Reg. #29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

65 Woods End Road
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-1160

September 6, 2000